DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 163 JC 850 012

AUTHOR	Tyree, Larry W.; And Others
TITLE	Facing the Challenges of the Future: The 1984 Presidents Academy Award Addresses. AACJC Leadership Bookshelf Series, Number 2.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-87117-136-8
PUB DATE	84
NOTE	39p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, National Center for Higher Education, Suite 410, One Dupont Circle NW, Washington, DC 20036 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Change Strategies; *College Administration; *College Planning; *Community Colleges; Curriculum Development; *Educational Change; Educational Quality; *Educational Trends; *Futures (of Society); Humanities Instruction; Speeches; Technological Advancement; Two Year Colleges; Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

These four addresses by community college presidents and chancellors were selected for recognition by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges' Presidents Academy. After an introduction by Larry W. Tyree, "Interrelationship of Career and Technical Programs with the Humanities," by Rose M. Channing, traces recent trends in vocational and humanities education, arguing that a true interrelationship of the technologies and humanities will recognize the purity of each, yet mix and match to yield desirable student outcomes. Donald H. Godbold's address, "Opportunities for Progress and Change in a Period of Economic Stress," identifies areas of needed change for community colleges, including the identification of student goals and needs, articulation with other educational segments, partnerships with the private sector, and the use of advanced technologies. In "Excellence and Innovation in Higher Education: Implications for Community Colleges," Richard K. Greenfield reviews responses of two-year college leaders to "A Nation at Risk" and argues that community colleges should take the offensive to bridge the ideals of equity and excellence. Finally, "Community Colleges: We Must Act to Shape Our Future," by Robert Parilla, reviews the challenges facing two-year college leaders, advocates a clearer definition and communication of the strengths of community colleges, and recommends greater political involvement. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED251163

The 1984 Presidents Academy Award Addresses

FACING THE CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wm. Harper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JC 850 012

AACJC

LEADERSHIP BOOKSHELF SERIES

2

The 1984 Presidents Academy Award Addresses

FACING THE CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE

Community College Presidents' and Chancellors' Addresses
Selected for Recognition by the Presidents Academy of
the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

American Association of
Community and Junior Colleges
National Center for Higher Education
Suite 410
One Dupont Circle NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-7050

Copyright 1984
Printed in the United States of America
ISBN 0-87117-136-8

This publication is provided as a membership service to chief executive officers of institutional members of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, in cooperation with the AACJC Presidents Academy. Additional copies may be purchased from AACJC for $6.00 each.

CONTENTS

Introduction
By Larry W. Tyree v

Interrelationship of Career and Technical Programs with the Humanities 1
By Rose M. Channing

Opportunities for Progress and Change in a Period of Economic Stress 9
By Donald H. Godbold

Excellence and Innovation in Higher Education: Implications for Community Colleges 22
By Richard K. Greenfield

Community Colleges: We Must Act to Shape Our Future 28
By Robert Parilla

AACJC Presidents Academy Speeches Program

One of the purposes of the Presidents Academy, as stated in its constitution, is to provide "a means for the development of in-service, professional development programs for chief executive administrators" of our nation's community, technical, and junior colleges. It was to help satisfy this purpose that the "speeches program" was initiated, resulting in this monograph.

In response to the program, 43 presidents and chancellors submitted 79 speeches for consideration by a committee of the Academy's Executive Committee, chaired by Abel Sykes of Kings River Community College and including David Ponitz of Sinclair Community College and Philip Ward of Glen Oaks Community College. The committee members indicated the task of selecting the four best speeches was extremely difficult because of the very high quality of all the speeches that were submitted.

The Presidents Academy extends its appreciation to the 43 chief executive officers who participated in the program and to Abel Sykes and the other members of the Executive Committee who coordinated the project. Presidents Rose Channing, Donald Godbold, Richard Greenfield, and Robert Parilla are congratulated for the selection of their speeches as "the best of the best."

We hope that our colleagues will enjoy and benefit from this monograph which we offer as a service of your Presidents Academy. We also encourage your continued support of the Academy's programs and services.

Larry W. Tyree
Chairman
Presidents Academy

Interrelationship of Career and Technical Programs with the Humanities

By Rose M. Channing

In this century, a tendency has developed to characterize academe according to the tone of events within particular decades. We look back on the turbulent '60s or on the passive, uncertain '70s, and we talk about the challenges of academic survival in the '80s. What challenges? What strategies for survival? Survival for what?

Many challenges can be identified, spanning a wide spectrum, from the individual inner self out toward global dimensions. We struggle with our own self-identification, personal views and values, ask who am I and to what purpose? We relate to people and to life in a cosmos that has a past, present, and future. Most of us need to work and look for meaning in our lives in relation to ourselves, significant others, peers, and the wider community. Our lives, including our work world and personal world, are challenged daily by external influences of community, state, national, and global

---

Rose M. Channing is president of Middlesex County College in Edison, New Jersey. She received the bachelor's degree from New York University and master's degrees and doctorate from Teachers College, Columbia University. She is a member of the Liaison Committee of AACJC and the National League for Nursing; a member of the Executive Committee of the AACJC Presidents Academy; a member of the Executive Committee of the AACJC International/Intercultural Consortium; and a member of the AACJC Board of Directors.

events. How do we plan for survival? Build a shelter, store our goods, and keep everyone else away for fear they will take what is ours? Do we seek power and more money, believing that more is better? That money, in itself, will ensure survival?

You do not need to search very deeply for analogies here. We, as educators, are deeply involved personally in these struggles and, at the same time, are considering how to educate students toward their particular survival ends. Do we help them to learn for a job or for coping with life? Is there a difference or a separation? What should our curricula include? What teaching strategies need to be employed? What experiences do we need to provide for them? How many dollars will be required for higher education and who will pay?

Regrettably, the struggle for survival in academe is inextricably related to the financing of higher education. For the past few years, and increasingly so at present, much time and effort are devoted to obtaining sufficient funds to balance college budgets. It is tragic when balancing a budget becomes an end rather than the means to operate an effective educational system. Boyer and Kaplan made the following observation about money:

> *Though the metaphors in use today to describe the problem suggest doughboy perils (retrenchment), corsetry (belt-tightening, the squeeze, the crunch), and thermodynamics (the steady state), the real topic is absolutely clear: money. It is hunted by administrators, coaxed from alumni, eked out by legislatures, demanded by departments, managed by computers, accepted graciously from students, and eaten by inflation. Money is important, to be sure. The life and death of institutions can depend on it. . . even utopian solutions to the universities' fiscal woes would not begin to address questions of purposes and priorities. Education for what and for whom? Learning toward what ends, with which curricula, and in what kind of a world? Questions like these give meaning to our money worries; they should set the terms for subsequent tugs-of-war; yet amidst the anxiety of austerity, questions like these are the ones that are barely discussed.*[1]

Discussions that are held too often consider technical education *versus* liberal education, presuming incompatibility. Over the years, as technical programs developed, emphasis seemed to be placed on relevancy of courses to work-related theory and skills.

[1]Ernest L. Boyer and Martin Kaplan, *Educating for Survival* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1977): 13.

Humanities courses were squeezed out as demands for greater specialization increased. Students in general were viewed too often as either career or general education oriented. Boyer and Kaplan treat this point as follows:

> *. . . It is suggested that the collegiate tradition of formal education is demeaned if it seems to lead directly to a job. But such a view distorts the present and denies the past. If the truth be told, education from its earliest days has been introduced and defended precisely because of its practicality, because of what it has prepared students to do. . . work is not dishonorable. . . work is universal; it tells a great deal about people and cultures on a very personal level. For many of us, work is an expression of who we are and where we fit. . . education while its purpose must always go beyond work, does not and should not bypass the centrality of work—historically, culturally, and personally. If education cannot relate to that part of human life devoted to productivity—even at times, creativity—then it has failed most fundamentally.*[2]

The challenge here is to educate holistically for life, a part of which is work and a part of which is a personal life outside of the job.

While we educate in the present, we are actually preparing students not so much for today as for their future place in the world—a world that is likely to be far different from that which we now know. Most of us can't begin to imagine what life and work will demand of humans in the decades ahead. Looking back into the past four decades, we will find that more technological advancement has occurred in that relatively short span of time than in centuries past. Along with the rapid development of high technologies, people are confronted daily, in life and in work, with the fallout from one national and global crisis after another, running the gamut of life's concerns.

Consider the use and abuse of world resources, economic, political, and military problems, along with a host of social problems such as starvation, discrimination, wholesale migration of populations, environmental and health hazards, mental and emotional deterioration, along with alcohol and drug abuse. These are not just someone else's problems. We need to deal with them in both the workplace and in our personal lives.

These observations are pertinent as we look at what is happening in our community colleges. There is no question in my mind that there must be an interrelationship of technologies with the

[2]Ibid., 69-70.

humanities if we are to achieve our goal of educating students effectively for the future. I remembered and searched out a paper by Lewis R. Fibel on "Technical Education," written many years ago, when the liberal arts-oriented junior colleges began to feel pressures to include career-oriented programs. It contained some of the basic elements upon which technical programs were built. Fibel defined technical education as follows:

> *Although many definitions of technical education are used in different contexts, I chose to define the term for the purposes of this paper, as education which (1) is organized usually into two-year curriculums at the college level, (2) emphasizes work in the field of science and mathematics which is frequently related to engineering and industry, (3) gives much attention to technical knowledge and to general education, but also stresses practice and skill in the use of tools and instruments, (4) leads to competence in one of the technical occupations and usually results in the granting of an associate degree, and (5) includes a core of general education courses in English, humanities, social sciences, and liberal arts, up to perhaps one-quarter of the total credits.*

He describes the objectives of technical education:

> *The objectives of a good program in technical education are three: (1) to provide the potential for immediate employment on a technical level with only reasonable further on-the-job training, (2) to provide the additional potential for advancement within that organization and the flexibility to adjust to technological change, and (3) to make a contribution to the general education of the student.*[3]

As the comprehensive community college evolved, career and technical programs proliferated as rapidly as the number of colleges. A level of education, related to a new level of employment, came into its own—the technician or paraprofessional or midmanager. This led to a whole host of developments in the community colleges whose mission was defined as being relevant to the needs of the community and the wide and varied constituency it served. Very discrete career and technical programs were initially developed as electrical and mechanical technologies, health technologies such as nursing and dental hygiene, business technologies such as secretarial science and hotel, restaurant, and institution management, and science such as chemical or biological technologies. To these were added one-year certificate programs

[3]Lewis R. Fibel, *Technical Education* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967).

and extensive short-term offerings in community education. The nature of the student body consequently changed to what is now called "nontraditional."

The nontraditional student and the focus on career education influenced curriculum development to the point where the majority of courses included were those in the particular specialty or those deemed relevant to the occupation. Students who were adults seeking job skills or students with deprived elementary and high school preparation for college, exhibited little interest in humanities courses.

Career and technical programs are admittedly directed to a specific goal which is preparation for work. It follows that the predominent consideration focused on courses through which the knowledge and skills of the speciaity could be achieved. The associate in applied science degree was devised requiring a distribution of credits in general education within the total required for the degree. Some of the programs were developed according to guidelines set by professional, specialized accrediting agencies that required heavy concentration in the specialty areas. What little latitude was left for general education was usually satisfied by the social sciences, leaving no room in crowded career programs for humanities courses.

Somewhere along the line, during the '70s, the trend toward vocationalism escalated in community colleges and the decline in the marketability of a liberal arts education was viewed as inevitable. Potential liberal arts majors shifted to preprofessional or career-oriented programs. David Breneman describes this in an article entitled "The Humanities in a Technological Society," which appeared in the June 1980 issue of the *American Association of Higher Education Bulletin*. He states that "in 1968, 51.4 percent of bachelor's degrees were awarded in academic disciplines; by 1977, this figure had dropped to 42.1 percent. The number of bachelor's degrees awarded in languages and letters in 1972 was 92,100; five years later, the number had plunged to 61,800, a drop of 33 percent. Students were clearly responding rapidly and in large numbers to the depressed labor market by seeking instrumental education that would provide an advantage in the search of jobs."[4] He observed that the humanities seemed destined to be under continuing pressure from these forces for several more years.

[4]David W. Breneman, "The Humanities in a Technological Society," *AAHE Bulletin* 32, no. 10 (June, 1980): 1.

A combination of forces causes faculty and administrators in community colleges to fall into a mode of competition rather than cooperation in making decisions about program requirements, availability of, or encouragement of students in technology programs to select humanities courses as electives. Factors which mitigate against stressing the mandated importance of the humanities in career and technical education include requirements for approval and accreditation, the demands of the job market, and the nontraditional student body. Some career-oriented faculty espouse the more narrow preparation and are not willing to work toward a balanced curriculum. Others are sympathetic and will discuss it, but the specialties win out in their decisions. Few actually work diligently in cooperation with humanities faculty seriously to seek ways to achieve this balance.

The fate of humanities courses is also influenced by the students themselves. Under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, a monograph that reviewed patterns of curriculum in the humanities in two-year colleges was published and the following was found: "The humanities remain alive, maintaining their traditional form in the 'college parallel' courses, often reforming in interdisciplinary combinations in courses for the 'new' students."[5] The report goes on to say that:

> *Curriculum in the community college—the dominant type of subbaccalaureate, accredited, associate degree-granting institution—is dictated by student preference, not institutional philosophy. The community college is dedicated to giving the community the kind of education it wants. Accordingly, except in the technical fields that have strict requirements imposed by outside agencies, a student can put together a program comprised pretty much of the courses he takes of his own volition. And what he elects to take is dominated by the requirements of the baccalaureate transfer institution to which he aspires, or by his own interests and tendencies of the moment. In this climate the humanities must stand on their own, competing with job training programs and hobby courses, as well as with the other disciplines that students favor.*[6]

There are, however, so many convincing arguments for inter-

[5]Center for the Study of Community Colleges and ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, *The Humanities in Two-Year Colleges: Reviewing Curriculum and Instruction* (Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Community Colleges and ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1975): 1.

[6]Ibid., 1-2.

relating humanities with career and technical education. Perhaps the real challenge is our belief in this premise and the implementation of workable strategies for success. There are many points of view being expressed. One rather dim view is taken by Robert Heilbroner as he asks, "Is there hope for man?" He goes on to answer:

> *If then, by the question, is there hope for man? we ask whether it is possible to meet the challenges of the future without the payment of a fearful price, the answer must be: There is no hope. . . the human prospect is not an irrevocable death sentence. It is not apocalypse or doomsday toward which we are headed, although the risk of enormous catastrophes exists.*
>
> *The prospect is better viewed as a formidable array of challenges that must be overcome before human survival is assured and that can be overcome by the saving intervention of nature, if not by the wisdom and foresight of man. The death sentence is therefore better viewed as a contingent life sentence—one that will permit the continuance of human society, but only on a basis very different from that of the present, and probably only after much suffering during the period of transition.*[7]

Another point of view is expressed by George Bonham in an article "Demystifying the Humanities":

> *Whatever ails us as a civilization, it is not the humanists that will ultimately suffer the most, but the vast majority of the rest of us who are rapidly losing our sense of place, our more profound knowledge of human location. Facts, if scattered on some shallow ground without a broader web of understanding, remain unconnected bits, unfettered by a sense of what is to the left and to the right, to the immediate and to the distance.*[8]

I would submit a challenge to the humanities faculties. More has to happen than to list a number of disciplines, identify and clump courses into a bundle called the humanities, and list them in a catalog. Technocrats pass over them as dispensable; they look good, but are not essential in preparing for a job. What strategies are being devised to present the humanities as preparation for human skills that are just as essential as technical skills?

It is not productive for academic humanists to band together and bemoan the losing state of the art to themselves. In doing battle for survival, forces must be gathered, armed with convincing

---

[7]Boyer and Kaplan, *Educating for Survival*, 72–73.

[8]George Bonham, "Demystifying the Humanities," *Change* 12, no. 7 (October 1980): 17.

arguments, and deployed among technical faculty, administrators, and employers. Perhaps some fresh ammunition can be obtained from a new commission report on the humanities in American life, which is obtainable from the University of California Press. In commenting on this commission report Bonham states:

> *Perhaps the main theme of the Commission's findings is that most of the maladies that now afflict the humanities cannot be cured by vast infusions of monies...the academic humanities cannot be resuscitated by vast emoluments if their classrooms remain empty, if employers eschew liberal arts graduates in favor of more narrowly educated specialists, and if lower schools fail to enrich their students early in life.*[9]

Seven major recommendations were made in the commission report, among which were improved quality of the elementary and secondary schools, strengthening humanities research, reaffirming within education the values of the humanities, closer collaboration of educational and cultural institutions as well as between humanities, science, and technology.

A true interrelationship of the technologies and humanities will recognize the purity of each, yet mix and match to yield desirable outcomes experienced by students. These should include wisdom from the past, orientation to and exploration of present day knowledge and skills, together with the ability to think, analyze, synthesize, develop values, and plan for an unknown future. There is a great need to improve the skills of writing, to restore the excitement of reading, to value the ability to speak other languages, and to nurture cultural awareness and appreciation.

Yes, there are challenges, but there are also strategies waiting to be discovered and used. To career-oriented faculty I would say, "Dare to educate humanistic technologists." To the humanities faculty I would say, "Draw your career-oriented faculty and nontraditional students into the exciting orbit of the humanities."

---

[9]Ibid.

This address was delivered before the New Jersey Consortium on the Community College, Inc. Teaching/Learning Task Force-Community College Faculty, Mount Laurel, New Jersey, March 28, 1981.

Opportunities for Progress and Change in a Period of Economic Stress

By Donald H. Godbold

During this period of economic stress and fiscal austerity, community colleges are being closely scrutinized and their mission being challenged.

Breneman and Nelson observe a tension between instructional mission and the financing of community colleges.[1] They predict that this tension will grow during the next two decades predicated on two factors: the 25 percent drop in the traditional college-age population and community colleges' ability to attract adult markets at the expected levels through the colleges' efforts to provide programs of lifelong learning. Community colleges are under particular scrutiny because of their present multifaceted mission. In a climate of restrictive funding for education and increased

[1]David W. Breneman and Susan C. Nelson, *Financing Community Colleges: An Economic Perspective* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1981).

Donald H. Godbold presently serves as chancellor and district superintendent of the Peralta Community College District headquartered in Oakland, California, a post he has held since 1980. He is a veteran of more than 30 years in education, and has served as college president and chief executive officer in the Oakland Community College District in Michigan and Community College of Denver systems. He received his bachelor of science and master of education degrees from Wayne State University, and the doctor of philosophy degree from the University of Michigan.

scrutiny of the value of all publicly supported activities, community colleges question their continued commitment to comprehensiveness, particularly in relation to such areas as community service and non-credit courses. They also question the efficacy of the transfer function.

Alexander Astin's research supports this concern about the transfer function. He has found that, in general, students enrolled in community colleges who aspire to pursue the baccalaureate degree have less chance of persisting towards that goal than those who go directly from high school to four-year institutions.

A more recent study by Astin, which primarily relates to minorities in higher education, confirms this position. He states:

> *Community colleges have been less successful, however, in performing their transfer function. Our data indicate that whereas three in four community college freshmen intend to get the baccalaureate, only one in four actually does so. What makes the attrition problem especially severe is the heavy concentration of minority students in community colleges, particularly in states like California and Texas that have a hierarchical, three-tier system of public higher education. Because many minority students do not meet the admissions requirements of four-year institutions, they are forced to enroll in community colleges. For some of these students, the community college's open door leads to a dead end. Moreover, many of those community college entrants who succeed in transferring to a senior institution find themselves as students with advanced standing but without the resources and services that are ordinarily available to entering freshmen—for example, financial aid and orientation.*[2]

Another study by Dorothy Knoell[3] for the California Postsecondary Education Commission also questions the traditional mission of community colleges. Knoell identifies six major issues that confront community colleges in the 1980s:

1. *Overcoming the myth of the "two-year college."* Students, many of whom already have degrees, should be made aware that they can enroll without prohibition throughout their lifetimes.

---

[2]Alexander W. Astin, *Final Report of the Commission on the Higher Education of Minorities* (Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, 1982). This report is part of an overall study titled *Minorities in American Higher Education* by Alexander W. Astin, published in hardcover by Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, in May 1982.

[3]*Missions and Functions of the California Community Colleges* (Sacramento: California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1981). Dorothy Knoell, principal researcher.

2. *Rethinking open enrollment within open admission.* Community colleges need to better implement the open-door admissions philosophy as it relates to a student's proficiency and his or her program and curriculum placement upon entering.
3. *Improving articulation with secondary schools.* The need exists to better identify the academic skills needed for college-level work and improve programs of student preparation for postsecondary educational experiences.
4. *Reconsidering student affirmative action.* Should relatively scarce state resources be used for severely disadvantaged minorities as opposed to the disadvantaged who can be prepared for college and university work? And would disadvantaged minority students with academic potential and interest in working towards the baccalaureate degree be better served as entering freshmen at four-year colleges?
5. *Providing remediation.* What level of remedial education should community colleges provide and to what extent should courses be adapted to the level of basic skills exhibited by students?
6. *Assuring transfer.* There has to be an increase in the number of students transferring to the four-year college and university and improvement in their competitiveness at the upper division level.

The Knoell study also refers to the economic payoff to vocational students in community colleges, a payoff that is often cited as one of the advantages for enrolling. Although inconclusive, the data from studies to which she refers raise some question about the comparative advantages of vocational training at community colleges, training offered in high school, and a nonvocational college education.

Running corollary to the question of what is best for the student is the competition between segments of higher education for students. The University of California at Berkeley, in the fall of 1980, recorded the largest enrollment in its history. The university attributes the increase to its attraction of more first-year entering freshmen, either by student choice or recruitment, who ordinarily would have gone to the community college. The University of California at Berkeley is also offering a special admissions program for marginal students who need further preparation to compete successfully in college-level programs. Ironically, the Peralta Community College District has collaborated with the University to provide the basic skills instruction a segment of these students need.

As proponents of the community college movement, we defend our traditional mission with the belief that what we do, we do well; that we are truly meeting student and community needs, and that we are providing equal access to education beyond high school. We cite the evidence of instructional flexibility, diversity of students of all ages, and increasing enrollments to document that position. However, all of the above studies seriously challenge our defense. That challenge becomes particularly significant in a climate of economic stress and diminishing resources.

The above scenario and prevailing economic influences have signaled the need for a self-appraisal of our institutions and the quality of our product. We need also to look at what it is we are about. The challenge to our mission presents an opportunity to make the changes necessary for the enhancement and continued progress of community colleges and the greater appreciation of our role as educational and training institutions. We can accomplish this self-appraisal while continuing to serve the function of providing access to education beyond high school. What opportunities for self-appraisal and change exist?

Breneman and Nelson, Astin and Knoell, among others, have questioned both the quality of community colleges and the success of our students, especially minority students. The urban community colleges represent the major point of entry for minority students.

Forty percent of all students and 22.3 percent of minorities who enter college as first-time freshmen do so at community colleges. Minority students enrolled at community colleges also constitute 38.8 percent of the total undergraduate enrollment in higher education.[4] Many of the students within this population are the first members of their families to attempt higher education; a substantial portion of them also suffer from some degree of economic disadvantage. The philosophy and mission of community colleges are of great importance to them.

I am an advocate of the open-admissions policy, but I feel that the lack of supportive data has made its success questionable. In order to retain the concept of open admissions, we must tie it into a process that will enhance the probability of student success. To accomplish this end we need to do a better job of identifying our students and their goals.

---

[4]American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C., February 1982.

I am proposing a model for categorizing student needs such as the following: 1) the degree- or certificate-seeking student, full- or part-time basis, whether transfer or vocational; 2) the special-interest student, interested in personal growth and development, skills upgrading or licensure; and 3) the casual student pursuing self-fulfillment or nonvocational personal needs. To go along with this identification scheme is the notion of a contractual agreement between student and institution at the time of admission.

A student, for instance, who declares himself to be seeking a degree in an academic or vocational area, whether full- or part-time, would commit himself to the satisfactory completion of a prescribed curriculum or program, including the remedial or basic skills courses necessary for success. A condition of enrollment for such a student could require that before being allowed to take a fourth course, or enroll for a second term, he submit himself for a full assessment and diagnostic workup and abide by any remedial needs prescribed. Students who do not progress satisfactorily towards their goal or who fail to comply with the contractual agreement would be denied the opportunity to register until doing so or until a program reclassification or adjustment is determined.

Likewise, a certificate-seeking student would agree to terms related to the attainment of the certificate. The agreement with the special-interest student would be the attainment of the goal specified. The casual student would not be able to attain a degree or certificate unless there was a change in his designation. Students would be held to their course of study and could not change unless approved by their counselor or advisor. The intent here is for student success and for the establishment of standards for continuance in school. This contractual arrangement has proven successful for street academies as well as graduate schools.

An admissions arrangement of this type should prove instrumental in enhancing the transfer function and the success of students who transfer to four-year institutions. Student retention and success of the transfer function beg the need for structured curricula, appropriate student proficiency, strict standards of achievement, competent faculty, creative instruction, and a quality program of student assessment. The delineation of students would also allow greater attention to be focused on the transfer student and encourage more students to transfer—particularly from among minorities – than are presently doing so.

The philosophy of open admissions and student assessment has continually represented an insurmountable dilemma for community colleges. Student success in community colleges mandates that a program of admissions and student assessment be established with which students must comply for continued enrollment. The idea here is not to limit access conditioned upon assessment, but to support a manner by which access and assessment can take place. The above delineations of students and contractual agreements should provide this opportunity. The program of assessment, counseling, and guidance, however, must be comprehensive, sophisticated, professional, responsive to referrals, and respected by students and faculty.

The press of financial resources is forcing my district to examine ways to become more cost effective. We are presently planning to develop a central registrar's office for five colleges. Also included in this project is the development of a district assessment center to serve the purpose suggested above. A success-oriented program of admissions should improve student success and allay much of the current concern about institutional quality.

Complementary to a successful assessment program must be a quality program of student services, particularly that which is typified as counseling. I have been outspoken about the need for better quality, more efficient and functional counseling programs than the usual "one counselor per 750 students" approach. There is a need for programs that provide more "hands-on" contact with students to interpret diagnostic information, prescribe courses of action, give advice, and assist students in sorting out and examining options that will have significance to their future wellbeing.

To accomplish these needs, I have been an advocate of the team approach to counseling. The team is composed of a trained, certificated master counselor, paraprofessional(s), and peers. Rather than 15 counselors for 15,000 students, nine or ten teams of four persons at the same approximate cost as for 15 counselors, will allow more hands-on contact with students than under the present system. To work more effectively, students, upon registration, will have to be assigned to a team. The students assigned will constitute that team's case load. Each team, guided by the master counselor, can develop intrateam specializations that could be effectively used by the students assigned to it. It thus becomes the team's responsibility to develop an effective program of guidance and counseling for its students. During my tenure as vice president and chief executive officer of the Auraria campus for the Community College

of Denver, this model was effectively implemented and well appreciated at that institution. It can be developed on a cost-effective basis and has proven effective in serving students.

Community colleges must also improve their relationship and articulation with other segments in the educational hierarchy. No longer can we afford to "do our own thing." The competition for scarce resources requires that we join in consortia with secondary schools and four-year institutions in the delivery of educational services to the community. We must assist the secondary schools in the preparation of students for postsecondary education, whether at the community college or the university level. Likewise, we must collaborate with the four-year colleges and universities in the development of jointly sponsored programs for student success. Joint collaboration on course content of faculty from secondary schools and two- and four-year colleges will serve to improve curricula and program articulation, as will the establishment at the community college of intracollege committees or commissions to oversee the transfer function.

Programs at both levels (i.e., secondary school to community college and community college to four-year colleges and universities) can be those of concurrent enrollment, joint teaching arrangements and the sharing of resources ranging from student assessment and career guidance centers and facility usage, to the sharing of the variety of means for telecommunications access to the community. The Peralta District has a student-managed cable TV station (PCTV). The station has its own dedicated channel and is on the air nine hours per day, five days a week. In cooperation with Oakland Public Schools, it can also cablecast on their Channel 13. PCTV is also cooperating with the University of California, Berkeley, in the sharing of instructional television fixed service (ITFS).

Community colleges are proud of their occupational and vocational programs. The future success of community colleges as training resources in occupational and vocational skills, however, will depend on the relevance of these programs to employers, length of time to train students, and the relationships established by community colleges with the private sector. All of these variables are particularly important in a time of dwindling resources. Community colleges must take the initiative to become more closely involved with the private sector in skill training. Such an involvement can prove effective in determining the specification of skills needed for employment potential of our graduates. There is a need to develop

programs that are accelerated, open-entry, open-exit, modular in design, and those reflective of the new era of technology.

The Peralta Community College District is now involved in specialized training programs with the General Motors Corporation, the electronics and cable TV industry, and Wang Word Processing Corporation, among others. In these programs there is a cooperative agreement between the district and the private sector to provide equipment and to share the teaching responsibility.

The ability of community colleges to adapt program content and length of training to private sector needs will better allow them to represent themselves as viable training resources. As a member of the private industry council in Oakland, California, I have seen on several occasions proprietary schools and community agencies collaborate with the private sector in obtaining funds for training programs already available at the community college.

Our problem is one of adaptability and fast turnaround. The private sector is spending money in the billions on their own training programs, some of which could support training programs at community colleges. Urban community colleges cannot be responsive to the private sector until we become more adaptable to meeting its needs. A continuous relationship between community colleges and the private sector not only would make the colleges more adaptable; it also would allow them the opportunity to enter into contractual agreements for the delivery of training services. These could help subsidize program costs, improve cost effectiveness, and assure employment for students upon completion.

In an era of declining resources, it is imperative that partnerships with the private sector be established that are mutually beneficial, relevant to employer needs, cost effective, and employment oriented. Activities of this kind can do much to allay the inconclusive evidence reported about the efficacy of occupational and vocational training at the community college level.

Community colleges, if they are to be viable training resources, must also be responsive to the era of high technology and rapid technological change. Now, more than at any other time, colleges must understand technology, not only for the training of persons for employment but in the use of the technology itself. Not only must there be the partnership with the private sector to provide the training, there must be enough organizational flexibility to accommodate the rapidly and constantly changing needs for training and upgrading at the greatest reduced cost, particularly during

times of high unemployment. It is estimated that 600,000 jobs are going unfilled in New York City because of a lack of persons with the technical skills to fill them. These rapid changes in the "high tech" area often dictate needs for training that defy many of our traditional approaches to instruction.

The employment needs for high-tech industries are such that they like to be located where there is a readily available labor pool. Available labor pools are usually found near training opportunities. For urban community colleges to take advantage of this rapidly growing industry, they must work in conjunction with the private sector to establish centers specifically dedicated to the development of a basic entry-level labor pool readily available to the high-technology industry that can develop a product that receives the sanction of the industry. Partnerships with the high-technology industry to share teaching responsibility could be established. These also would allow college instructors to work in the industry to acquire a hands-on knowledge of skills where necessary. Private sector partnerships would also help community colleges maintain the most current equipment. Because of diminishing public resources, it will no longer be feasible to deliver self-contained, distinct programs for all of the technologies involved. The instruction at such centers then would reflect cluster-cores of educational and skill competencies that are basic to the several areas represented by the high-technology fields. The cluster-core concept could prove to be efficient and expeditious. It could set its own standards and attain its own evaluation of quality.

Community colleges of the future must make use of high technology both in instruction and in its administrative processes. We can no longer allow ourselves to be more people intensive than is necessary to maintain the human quality required to accomplish our mission. In an area of rising personnel costs, increasing knowledge, and greater expectations of educational institutions accompanied by reduced resources, it will be necessary to become more hardware intensive and technically innovative. Community colleges must also learn how to use computers, telecommunications, microcomputers and word processors, laser technology, and all other relevant new technologies to reach other communities, faciliate learning, and reduce the cost of administration by increasing efficiency.

This period of austerity is teaching us that community colleges must develop organizational structures that are streamlined, cost

effective, and efficient. Particularly in multicollege districts, we can ill afford to duplicate all administrative processes or programs at each college within easy commuting distance from each other. Program comprehensiveness for colleges in a district must be determined on the basis of logic and reason.

The era of advanced technology easily lends itself to reducing duplication and increasing efficiency without a loss in effectiveness or quality. Very few community colleges have risen to the level of this challenge. It is appropriate here to state that beyond the problem of finances is also the problem of faculty and administrative inertia and some resistance to change.

As the need has been cited that a closer relationship with the private sector is necessary, there is also the need for a closer relationship with other public and governmental agencies. Community colleges should be regarded by all governmental agencies as the primary resource for paraprofessional education and skilled training in areas that do not require the baccalaureate degree. Governmental agencies should collaborate with community colleges in the development of new programs that are concerned with improving the welfare of people through education, training, and employment. In California, the governor is promoting a relationship of this type in a multimillion dollar program entitled "Investment in People." If funded, community colleges are to be involved in several components. In the proposal, community college enrollment growth for 1982–83 has been specifically tied to the development of programs to train students for employment in high-technology industries.

Similarly, urban community colleges should be aware and prepared to take advantage of governmental programs being espoused, such as "enterprise zones." These relate to the partnership of government with industry in the preparation and training of persons indigenous to certain depressed geographical areas where there is high unemployment and a labor pool without the skills needed to qualify for employment. Again, in the implementation of the enterprise-zone concept, community colleges should be considered by government and the private sector as the primary resource for delivery of the necessary education and training. Community colleges must be adaptable to the training needs for this kind of program, and must take the initiative to ensure that their involvement occurs.

Community service is one of the hallmarks of the community college movement. At a time when money is scarce at both ends of

the spectrum—that is, in the pockets of the people who comprise our service area and also at the funding sources—the question may be raised, Is a program of community service a legitimate responsibility and expense of the community college beyond its primary function of education and training? It is my feeling that community colleges should play a significant role in providing community service activities for their service areas. Formerly, the tax situation in California for community colleges allowed community service programs to be offered at no additional cost to the community. This tax structure no longer exists. Community colleges are now forced to find other means, including fees, to provide these programs and services. Community colleges should serve the function of coordination and administration rather than subsidization. Community service programs must be financially self-sustaining or otherwise subsidized with due consideration given to the economic status of the service area. To eliminate totally a program of community service because of diminishing resources would further add to this deplorable state of affairs. It is during these times more than during times of prosperity that community service programs are needed. The establishment of a coordinating mechanism to work with local structures such as community-based organizations, business and industry, governmental agencies, churches, and local schools, among others, should provide a creative mechanism to accommodate this need.

Community colleges are taking a serious initiative to become more heavily involved in the establishment of foundations and auxiliary organizations. These serve as a means of attracting money to be used for special purposes that cannot be accommodated within the policies that govern budgeted general fund money. Foundations can be used as repositories of money donated by philanthropists or solicited by an active staff. They can also be used for student scholarships, support of programs in the fine arts, community service, humanitarian interests, and contractual arrangements to provide instruction. The development of a foundation or auxiliary organizations should not be overlooked as a means of attracting or pursuing financial support from external sources that can be used to support community service programs and other activities. The task of finding a means of support for community service will not be easy, but it can be accomplished.

Finally, community colleges should look upon this period of restrictive funding as a learning experience. It has not been a question

of whether it was coming but when. Now, it is here and we are minimally prepared for it; we can hardly document our case. Thousands of students have come through our doors. We preach a great gospel about what has happened to them. We know we have been good for all of them. But I do not know of a college that can document what has happened to most of them. Even attempts to form alumni associations most often fail. If we are good enough to exist and be supported by our citizens, we ought to be able to make a case for that support. The "walking with their feet" documentation is not acceptable to the private sector or the legislatures when there are no good answers to the difficult questions raised by them.

I am particularly concerned about what happens to our minority youth. If they are not transferring to four-year colleges, if they aren't prepared for work, where are they and what are they doing? These are questions urban community colleges in particular must be able to answer. Community colleges need to establish a means of documenting what they do: their successes, their failures, the efficacy of their instructional methods, and many other variables that will help tell their story to those who provide their support. Until they are able to do so, or until their constituents and students learn to appreciate them enough to take up their case with the powers that be, they will forever be under scrutiny, continually compared with the four-year institutions, and placed in the position of always justifying their reason for being.

I believe in community colleges and the role they play in the educational hierarchy and the service they provide to the community. I believe in their philosophy and their mission as I presently understand it. I know they have positively affected the lives of many students, particularly those who are minority. What is for certain is that community colleges are under fire—particularly urban community colleges, which enroll large numbers of minorities.

What I have attempted to do is point out some areas where community colleges need to make changes if they are going to continue to progress and be accessible to the kinds of students who need them the most. The need for some change has become more immediate because of this period of economic stress. However, the need for change has long been apparent. It may be good for community colleges that they are now being confronted with the reality of their mission for their own preservation. If community colleges believe in their mission, now is the time to make the changes

necessary to ensure their continued progress. If we do not make the changes, they may be made for us and the outcome may not be properly described as progress.

This address was delivered to the National Policy Conference, Urban Colleges in Transition, Detroit, Michigan, March 7–9, 1981.

Excellence and Innovation in Higher Education: Implications for Community Colleges

By Richard K. Greenfield

The tide of various blue-ribbon reports dealing with the need for educational reform has been rising for years, reaching a new peak with the publication a year ago of the final report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education. This "open letter" to the American people, entitled *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, is a call to arms in the face of our country being overtaken by world competitors in many areas of commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation. The "blame" for this fall from preeminence is laid heavily (and perhaps unfairly) at the door of our schools and colleges in such commission statements as: "...the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people."

This powerful report goes on to state that "Our society and its educational institutions seem to have lost sight of the basic purpose

---

Richard K. Greenfield has served as chancellor of the St. Louis Community College District since 1975. He was founding president of two community colleges in New Jersey and New York State. He serves on the boards of directors of the AACJC, the League for Innovation, and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. He is also a member of the AACJC/ACCT Joint Commission on Federal Relations. He received the bachelor of arts degree from Cornell University, and the master of arts and doctor of education degrees from Columbia University.

of schooling and of the high expectations and disciplined effort needed to attain them." It lists the rather well-known indicators of the risk we face—from adverse international comparisons of student achievement, over ten percent adult functional illiteracy, lower standardized test average achievement of high school students, the falling off of S.A.T. scores and college board achievement tests, the massive inability to demonstrate vital "higher order" intellectual skills, the huge increase in remedial courses and programs in community colleges and baccalaureate institutions, and the massive investments by business and the military in remedial basic education.

The commission then defines "excellence" in terms of individual learners performing at the boundary of their personal limits, schools and colleges setting high expectations and goals for all learners and helping students reach them in every possible way, and a society that embraces these policies and commits itself to their achievement in an increasingly fast-changing, competitive world that requires a lifetime of learning adaptation.

Most of the recommendations coming from various studies and blue-ribbon reports include 1) stiffening high school graduation requirements to lay down more strength in English, math, science, social studies, and computer science, including foreign language for the college-bound; 2) schools and colleges adopting higher expectations and more rigorous and measurable standards; 3) spending more time on learning (lengthening the school day and year); 4) improving the teacher corps in terms of preparation, salaries, and professional growth and status; and 5) holding educators, boards, and governmental leaders responsible for achieving these reforms and citizens responsible for providing the necessary fiscal support.

As Sandy Astin and others have pointed out, colleges and universities have tended to be "rated" in terms of quality and prestige by input yardsticks and relative selectivity in the admissions process. The more that is spent and charged, and the tougher the admission requirements, the "better" the college. The longer the list of impressive scholar/researcher/grantsman stars on the faculty, the better the teaching and learning opportunities for the lucky students. Hence, the prominence of Harvard and the other "Ivies," Stanford, and so on. But by these yardsticks, the open-door community colleges and most state colleges and universities fare poorly in public estimation, since the nonselective admissions process and

their low cost yields a very heterogeneous student body with lower general educational and socioeconomic status. It doesn't matter if the dedicated efforts of high-quality, student-oriented teaching, student services, and other support staff services result in impressive gains in student learning for so many! To quote John Gardner in his famous 1961 book entitled *Excellence—Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too?:*

> *We must develop a point of view that permits each kind of institution to achieve excellence* in terms of its own objectives—*in short, we reject the notion that excellence is something that only can be experienced in the most rarified strata of higher education. . . . We must ask for excellence in every form which higher education takes. . . . We should assert that a stubborn striving for excellence is the price of admission to reputable educational circles. . . . We must make the same challenging demands of students. . . . It is an appalling error to assume—as some of our institutions seem to have assumed—that young men and women incapable of the highest standards of intellectual excellence are incapable of any standards whatsoever, and can properly be subjected to shoddy, slovenly and trashy educational fare. . . . It is no sin to let average as well as brilliant youngsters into college. It is a sin to let any substantial portion of them—average or brilliant—drift through college without effort, without growth and without a goal.*

Gardner further states that "A conception which embraces many kinds of excellence at many levels is the only one which fully accords with the richly varied potentialities of mankind: It is the only one which will permit high morale throughout the society. . . . We need excellent physicists and excellent mechanics."

Put another way by U.S. Office of Education Assistant Secretary Donald Senese, "Excellence and equity need to go hand-in-hand, not as separate or adverse goals. How do we benefit the poor and minorities by giving them a substandard education in the name of equity and fairness?"

Shirley B. Gordon, president of Highline Community College in the state of Washington, commenting in the September 1983 issue of the AACJC *Journal* on the Commission on Excellence report, stresses that:

> *The open door is not incompatible with excellence, with high standards, and with meaningful expectations—expectations that require individuals to perform on the boundaries of their personal abilities. Each course can be rigorous, whatever the discipline or level. Each institution should demand that students do their best educationally. Making exceptions or lowering standards because many students work,*

have family responsibilities, or because the students aren't the most able, is undoubtedly a major disservice to the students and to society. To let students "get by," whatever their purpose, is not giving them a fair and honest return on an investment of time and money and is, in many respects, deceiving the students. To let students think that less than the best will do is one of the major factors that has put us all at risk.

As another Gardner points out (*David* Gardner, president of the University of Utah):

Compared with all other industrial societies, the U.S. has an extraordinarily nonselective educational system. In the United States, and virtually nowhere else until very recently, it is possible for a mildly persistent but singularly untalented student to complete high school, to attend a two-year college, and to transfer to some four-year institution and obtain a bachelor's degree.... The contrast between our system and those of most other societies in this regard is really threefold. First, the American system permits, or more accurately encourages, high percentages of students to remain in the educational system for longer periods of time. Second, the American system tends not to erect clear, well-marked boundaries between high and low status education either in the form of separate schools or in the form of impermeable divisions within schools. Finally, the American system tends to select by attrition rather than by examination. American students tend to drop out as often as they are flunked out.

From a comparative perspective, then, the American educational system rates high marks in terms of the breadth of its coverage as well as the performance level of its most able students. Both the Science and Mathematics international surveys have demonstrated that the top 5 to 10 percent of American secondary students move as well in these fields as do a similar proportion in other countries. Average performance levels of American students are, of course, lower because a far broader spectrum of students are retained in U.S. comprehensive high schools.

Community colleges throughout our land have sought to bridge the two ideals of equity and excellence in higher education. For many years, and to this day, our role in making access a reality has been recognized widely—indeed, comprehensive, open-door community colleges are acknowledged to have been the major American invention in higher education in the twentieth century and a prime mover on the "equity" front. Our reputation for excellence is another matter, despite the unfairness of so much of

the criticism that is leveled at us in the name of academic standards, program quality, grade inflation, student attrition, and faculty prestige.

As Judy Eaton summarized in her comprehensive AACJC *Journal* article in September 1982 entitled "Judging Community Colleges: Looking at Student Success":

> *Data have been increasingly available which tend to confirm that— • Community college students lack basic skill levels comparable to lower division students in four-year colleges and universities. • Community colleges themselves impose lower academic standards on students when compared with four-year colleges and universities. • Community college faculty and administrators are not as credentialled or as well-trained academically as four-year college or university faculty. • Community college students are commuters, heavily employed, and burdened with life responsibilities which consistently interfere with their academic progress.*

She then reviews briefly the criticisms of community colleges made by Breneman and Nelson's 1981 "bombshell," Richardson's concerns over student persistence and progress, the decline in the transfer function in California's community colleges, Sandy Astin's adverse views on how well community colleges do for their students, and Art Cohen's oft-criticized concerns over the fate of the liberal arts and general education in the context of the shifting emphasis toward compensatory and career education.

In essence, community colleges, as a group, fall short if they are measured solely on the basis of measuring transfer rates and acquisition of certificates or associate degrees, or if measured by the rate of attainment of bachelor's degrees by former community college students. This narrow, critical focus makes it necessary for us to push vigorously for broader criteria against which to measure our effectiveness, such as student achievement in terms of their own objectives, or achievement of viable skill levels. Moreover, it is time that we take the offensive in reviewing academic standards, instead of being pushed into it by the Veterans Administration and by the U.S. Office of Education, and in stating clearly the competency expectations we have for our students.

While a good deal of this fault-finding is based upon pure snobbishness with a socioeconomic class status and racist tinge, we should not be blind to the strong possibility that we may have erred in favor of mass equity at the expense of setting high expectations and pushing all of our students to their natural limits, including

those with better-than-average or superior intellectual capabilities. The pendulum is now swinging toward more rigor and more demands upon student motivation and performance. While we have to guard against this "reform" movement if it becomes a cloak for a revival of exclusionary policies, I believe that we should welcome this opportunity, i.e., equity *and* excellence. We have been in the forefront of the struggle for equity in higher education and we have made many unsung contributions to the search for excellence. It is time for us to take the lead in demanding more of ourselves, our students, and our institutions, in order to come closer to that elusive ideal of pushing all of our citizens, regardless of differences in capacities, to the limit of their abilities to perform.

This address was delivered at the annual meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, March 25, 1984.

Community Colleges: We Must Act to Shape Our Future

By Robert Parilla

One of my colleagues asked me why I had been involved in planning a program where everyone got together to tell everyone else how bad the financial future might be. The fact is that at Montgomery for a few years now we've been implementing a planning process whereby we've sponsored programs to enable us to examine factors that will influence the college in the future. The purpose of these programs is to bring us information and data so that our internal planning process can consider the issues that people are talking about as important to higher education.

At the outset of this year's planning effort, we began talking about a financial future topic and how we would treat it at Montgomery. We perceived that this might be a topic of statewide interest and

---

Robert Parilla was appointed president of Montgomery College effective July 1, 1979. Prior to this, he served as district executive vice chancellor of Cuyahoga Community College District in Cleveland, Ohio. He was appointed by the governor of Maryland to represent community colleges on the Segmental Advisory Committee, which is advisor to the State Board for Higher Education, and is a member of the Governor's Task Force on Nursing Education. He also serves as a member of the Liaison Committee of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the Council of Associate Degree Programs, National League for Nursing, and as chairman of the Associate Degree Nursing Task Force for the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. He received the bachelor of science degree from Kent State University, the master of arts degree from University of New Hampshire, and the doctor of philosophy degree from Florida State University.

decided to propose that other organizations cosponsor the examination with us. While we recognized that the information we would receive to present at this program might be less than positive, we believed that in order to plan effectively we needed to understand the bad as well as the good news. Therefore, we proceeded with the Financial Future program with the expectation that we would hear some bad news, but that as a result of hearing this news, we might be able to influence our financial future to be more positive than it might be if we did not hear and understand the information.

In order to begin to affect the somewhat gloomy financial news that we have been receiving in Maryland and many other states, we need to place this information in some context. We could expand to a broader issue that might help us to put the Financial Future program in a national context.

Certainly we could say that we live in extremely chaotic times. There are obviously large numbers of Americans who indicate that they are losing confidence in themselves and in the tried and true institutions that they have counted on in the past. They feel that we are constantly dealing with crises in America. We talk about crises of inflation, unemployment, technical obsolescence, crime, the fact that we don't trust our public officials, the fact that we're constantly involved with wars or terrorism, and other crises. Perhaps the worst crisis that we hear people talk about is an extreme crisis of leadership. There doesn't seem to be on the horizon or in our midst substantial leaders to guide us out of these chaotic times. Certainly all of us could expand these recent experiences to the last 20 or 30 years. During that time period there has been rapid change in conditions upon which we've always relied. Religion has changed. Our economic structures and conditions continue to change.

Alvin Toffler predicted a good many of the social changes and adjustments that we're dealing with today. He stated that many of us will be victims of "future shock"—victims of this kind of change. Toffler stated that there are four ways we deal with change. First, we tend to block out reality. We tend to say that the change is not going to happen; that it doesn't exist here, and therefore we can hide from it. The second is that we look for simple solutions. We assume that we can come up with a quick fix and all the problems will go away. Third, we sometimes withdraw into our own specialization. Instead of dealing with the big problems of the world we withdraw into the little world of our specialty and don't

let ourselves be bothered by the big changes in society. Finally, in Toffler's opinion, the worst problem that we have as victims of future shock is that we tend to look to the past for old solutions to new problems, an approach that simply won't work.

Recent studies by both psychologists and physicians have noted that these rampant changes are causing extreme stress in our society—stress that they say is leading to physical disease. They are saying that this kind of chaos and crisis could lead to physical collapse on the part of individuals and perhaps on the part of organizations. This research is of particular concern because I've heard people refer to the fact that if you really want to destroy somebody or something there are a number of ways to go about it. First, you can destroy their confidence in themselves or destroy their confidence in the organizations of which they are a part—destroy their ability to feel any reliability on those organizations or those tried and true institutions.

After you successfully convince people that they can't have a basis for confidence in themselves or in their organizations, then you can move to another level of destructiveness in terms of the individual or organization. You can move to destroy the individual's concern, commitment, or motivation to do anything about a particular problem. Certainly we've seen that happen in many instances. But when you destroy people's commitment to be involved, you find them withdrawing from the circumstances. They simply say it's not worth the effort. If I get involved, it will not make a difference. The problem will probably go away anyway, so I'll wait and see or let someone else worry about the problems. If this happens in education, if we no longer have the concern or the motivation to do anything about the problems, then certainly the doom and gloom predictions that we've heard regarding our financial future will come true.

Recent polls provide evidence of the loss of confidence throughout the country. When people are asked what kind of confidence they have in their organizations, they almost always say that they have very little confidence in many organizations. I was recently reading an old Gallup poll dealing with the issue of confidence. People in the advertising profession had about a 6 percent confidence level in the United States. Politicians had about a 9 percent level. Labor leaders noted 19 percent; business executives 20 percent; lawyers 40 percent; journalists 49 percent; and, thank God, college teachers had 79 percent confidence.

Certainly we do have problems in our communities, in our colleges, and in our country. We see people dropping out all the time. We see people who claim that they're burned out. We see pressing problems in our society that are the result of drugs and alcohol. We have this tremendous and growing mentality that if it feels good, do it. If it doesn't feel good or if it costs a little bit of time or effort or if risks are involved, then avoid it.

These kinds of societal crises are happening, but I submit to you that they don't have to continue to happen. We have a choice. We have a choice to take the high or the low road. Unquestionably, there is a lot to be cynical about, a lot to be pessimistic about. But we can take a more optimistic view. We can look at the word crisis and think of the definition that medical people give it. Medical people say that a crisis is a turning point: you either get worse or you get better; perhaps you can have some influence on whether you get worse or better. The Chinese, who as you know write in symbols, write the word "crisis" with two characters. The first character stands for the word "danger," which is perhaps how we look at crisis; but the second character is "opportunity." I think we too frequently look at crisis in terms of the danger and forget about the opportunity it may represent.

Whether we choose danger or opportunity, whether we choose pessimism or optimism, whether we choose losing or winning, really depends on leadership. It depends on each of us. Whether community colleges maintain public confidence depends on whether we maintain confidence in ourselves. Maintaining public credibility depends to a very great extent on whether or not we can maintain quality. We must maintain public concern for us and commitment to us if we hope to be able to motivate our leaders to political action.

The value of Maryland's Financial Future program was that even though it did tend to have people talk about the problems, it also produced a little bit of "double think" on our part. Double think requires us to ask, "Now that we've heard the problem, what can we do about it?" We need to continue to ask that question throughout the country. We must guard against concluding that someone else will solve the problems, someone else will take the responsibility. If we individually conclude that it doesn't matter if we get involved, then we'll be making a mistake. The greatest problem that we've got to overcome is the fact that many of us might feel that we don't have the opportunity to influence the future. The

reason we entered into a process of planning at Montgomery College is that we believed that if we can identify potential future problems, we can try to do something about them now. We can thereby avoid the serious consequences of the problem. If we wait for the problems to hit and don't try to anticipate them, we will deserve our fate.

There's no question that we face challenges as leaders, but I think we can prevail. Will we be able to maintain the mission of the community colleges? Will we be able to maintain our commitment to access, or will we close the institutions partially? Will we be able to improve quality? Will we have adequate funding? As high school enrollments decline, can we prevent unhealthy segmental battles among community colleges, the private sector, four-year institutions, and the universities? Can we play a role in the economic development of our state? Can we train the unemployed? Can we become involved in the tremendous change in technology that is occurring? Yes, we can get involved, and we can have an impact, but only if we choose to get involved and take the risks.

Support for education is really necessary if we believe in the future. No other public expenditure has as much to do with the future as does education, which is an investment in the future. I don't believe that an adequate number of studies have been conducted to show the public and the politicians that an investment in education really does pay off. We need to get about doing those kinds of studies. We need to show people the kinds of payoff that come from education. The research is our responsibility, not the government's.

In conclusion, there's no question that we in community colleges can be optimistic about our future. There's no question that we are institutions that provide hope to other people. Our students are enrolling because they are hopeful about the future. They have hope in their future, and they see us as an institution that helps provide an avenue to a better future for them. We can't lose sight of that fact. It's not enough, however, that we're currently strong; it's not enough that our enrollments continue to grow. It's not enough that certain things are going our way right now. If we sit back and say, yes, it is good, complacency will be bred.

What we have to do is define our strengths, communicate these strengths better to our constituencies, and become involved in political action. This is a democracy based on political activities; it's based on informing the public; it's based on informing the

politicians about what our needs are and why we have them. If we simply sit back and say we'll wait to see what our state does and then react, we'll wait to see what Washington does and then react, then we deserve what happens to us. If, on the other hand, we get together, if we get involved in planning what we think our best next steps are and then go actively about the business of making sure the public and the legislatures know what our agendas are, I think we can be successful. If we want to be leaders in this field, we're going to have to take some risks. I think the risks are worth taking. There's simply no question that we've got an extremely positive base on which to build.

This address was delivered at a conference in Annapolis, Maryland, sponsored by Montgomery College; the Institute for Research in Higher and Adult Education, University of Maryland; the Maryland State Board for Community Colleges; and the Maryland Association of Community College Trustees, December 3, 1982.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
FEB 1 1985